

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 12, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Claims 8-10 are amended to particularly point-out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments is found at least on paragraph [0059] – [0060] of the specification. Claims 1-12 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 6,570,855 to Kung et al (Kung), in view of US Patent No. 6,310,874 to Miller et al. (Miller). The Office Action took the position that Kung disclosed all of the features of these claims, except the feature of an external address resolution switch. The Office Action asserted that Miller disclosed this feature. Applicants submit that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any of the pending claims.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-5, 8, 11 and 12 depend, recites a network switch. The network switch includes a plurality of input ports that receive data packets, and an external address resolution interface connected to at least one of the plurality of input ports, the external address resolution interface externally transmitting the data packets for processing, and receiving the data packets after processing, wherein the external address resolution interface is coupled to an external address resolution switch. The network

switch further includes a memory management unit connected to the external interface; and a plurality of output ports connected to the memory management unit.

Claim 6, from which claim 9 depends, recites a method of processing a data packet in a network switch. The method includes receiving a data packet in an input port, transmitting the data packet from the input port over an interface to an external switch for address resolution, and processing the packet in the external switch. The method further includes transmitting the packet from the external switch to the interface, receiving the data packet in the interface from the external switch. The method further includes transmitting the data packet from the interface to a memory management unit, and transmitting the data packet from said memory management unit to an output.

Claim 7, from which claim 10 depends, recites a network switch. The network switch includes an input port receiving means for receiving a data packet in an input port, and an input port transmitting means for transmitting the data packet from the input port over an interface to an external switch for address resolution. The network switch further includes a processing means for processing the packet in the external switch, and an external switch transmitting means for transmitting the packet from the external switch to the interface. The network switch further includes an interface receiving means for receiving the data packet in the interface from the external switch, an interface transmitting means for transmitting the data packet from the interface to a memory management unit, and a memory unit transmitting means for transmitting the data packet from the memory management unit to an output port.

In certain embodiments, the present invention allows for flexibility and modularity in implementing ARL functions on an as-needed basis. Applicants submit that the pending claims recite features that are neither disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Kung is directed to an automatic call manager traffic gate feature. Kung discloses a router 200 (which can be a gigabit switch, Figure 2). The router includes a DNS server 214, which can be combined with other servers such as a call manager server 218 and a trivial file transfer protocol server into a single server. See column 7 lines 1-7. The Office Action admits that Kung fails to disclose the feature of an external address resolution module but alleges that Miller discloses this feature.

Miller is directed to a frame throttle. Figure 1 of Miller illustrates a switch that includes several input/output application specific integrated circuits 12, 14, 16, and 18 (I/O ASICS) that are interconnected via an address resolution processor 20.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claims. Specifically, the cited references fail to disclose at least the feature of a coupled external address resolution switch, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 6 and 7 because Miller fails to make up for the admitted deficiencies of Kung, and the combination is therefore an improper basis upon which to reject the claims.

Miller merely discloses “in a switch having an address processor . . .” and does not disclose or suggest the feature of coupling a switch having an address processor (alleged

external switch) to an external address resolution interface, as recited in the pending claims. Applicants submit that the combination of Kung and Miller is merely redundant and at best suggests a switch with an internal address processor. See column 2 lines 9-10 and column 3 lines 13-20. Thus, Miller fails to make up for the admitted deficiencies of Kung.

Further, applicants submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 8-10. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of detecting the presence of an external switch as recited in claims 8-10.

The Office Action appears to assert that Kung discloses an internal address resolution means in the absence of an external address resolution switch. The Office Action cites column 7 lines 1-3. However, Applicants submit that this feature is not even mentioned, much less disclosed or suggested in Kung. The cited portions of Kung merely state that certain servers i.e. call manager server 218, protocol server 131 and the domain name service server may be combined into a single server. Miller fails to make up for this deficiency.

Applicants submit that because claims 2-4 and 11 depend from claims 1, 6 and 7 respectively, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1, 6 and 7.

Based at least on the above, Applicants submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recite in any

of the pending claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 1-4 and 6-11 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kung and Miller and further in view of US Patent No. 6,768,742 to Godfrey (Godfrey). The Office Action took the position that Kung and Miller disclosed all of the features of claim 5, except the feature of an external resolution chip connected to the external interface. The Office Action asserts that Godfrey discloses this feature. Applicants submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 5. Specifically, claim 5 is allowable because claim 5 depends from claim 1, and Godfrey fails to make up for the deficiencies of Kung and Miller discussed above regarding claim 1.

Godfrey is directed to a on-chip local area network (LAN). Godfrey, at column 2 lines 16-18 discloses modules in the computer chip may operate as a DNS server. However, as clearly stated in Godfrey, the modules are internal (“each module in the computer chip . . .” column 2 lines 11-18). Thus, Applicants submit that Godfrey fails to cure neither the admitted deficiencies of Kung and Miller, nor the deficiencies discussed above regarding claim 1.

Based at least on the above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kung, in view of Miller, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,128,294 to Oura et al. (Oura). The Office Action took the position that Kung and Miller disclosed all of the features of claim 12 except the feature of an external address resolution switch including a buffering means. The Office Action asserts that Oura discloses this feature. Applicants submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 12.

Specifically, because claim 12 depends from claim 1, Applicants submit that Kung and Miller are deficient at least for the reasons stated above regarding claim 1 and Oura fails to make up for these deficiencies.

Oura is directed to a network connecting apparatus. The switch 20 checks the destination physical address of each received packet and that the switch may have a buffer (see column 2 lines 16-28 of Oura). However, Oura fails to mention, disclose or suggest the feature of an external address resolution switch. Therefore, Oura fails to cure the deficiencies of Kung and Miller discussed above.

Based at least on the above, Applicants submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.


Applicants submit that each of claims 1-12 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggest in any of the cited references taken individually or in combination.

Applicants request that each of the pending claims be allowed and this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Brown

Registration No. 51,091

Customer No. 32294

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

14TH Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:cbr